Appln. No.: 10/657,944

Amendment Dated: April 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2004

### **Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 11-31 are pending. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11-13, 17, 18 and 20-24 are amended. Claims 27-31 are newly added. Support for the amended and newly added claims is found on pages 16-19, 22-23 and 26-29 of the specification, in Figures 1, 2, 4, 5, 10 and 11, and in the corresponding originally-filed claims.

## Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure because it included multiple paragraphs. The abstract has been amended and now has only one paragraph. The Examiner objected to a typographical error on line 10 of the paragraph beginning on page 17, line 10. The typographical error has been corrected.

In view of the amendments to the specification, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

#### Objections to the Claims

Claims 2, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, and 24 were objected to for alleged informalities. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

# Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 21 was objected to as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner alleged that claim 21 recited a term that lacked antecedent basis. As amended, the terms of Page 9 of 15

Appln. No.: 10/657,944

Amendment Dated: April 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2004

claim 21 have antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

### Rejection in view of Satoh

Claims 1-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,404,302 to Satoh et al. ("Satoh"). Claim 1 includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by Satoh, namely, a band elimination filter that comprises a first terminal that "is grounded via only a first grounding point" and a second terminal that "is grounded via only a second grounding point." (emphasis added)

Satoh describes a low-pass filter with reference to Fig. 1 having an input terminal 16, an output terminal 17, and transmission lines 14a, 15a between the input terminal 16 and the output terminal 17. Both ends of each transmission line 14a, 15a are respectively grounded via acoustic resonators 11, 12 and 13. (Satoh at col. 4, lines 34-39).

In Figs. 3A-C, Satoh discloses circuit elements 31-35 in place of the transmission lines 14a, 15a of Fig. 1. The equivalent circuits include capacitors 31, 33, and 35 with one end connected to the acoustic resonators 11, 12 and 13 and the other end connected to ground. In other words, Satoh discloses a band-pass filter connected reactance elements (i.e., capacitors 31, 33 and 35) connected in parallel, resulting in low-pass characteristics.

The input terminal 16 and output terminal 17 of Satoh are each connected to ground via more than one grounding point. The input terminal 16 of Fig. 3A is connected to ground via acoustic resonator 11 and connected to ground via capacitor 31. Similarly, output terminal 17 is connected to ground via acoustic resonator 13 and connected to ground via capacitor 35.

Appln. No.: 10/657,944

Amendment Dated: April 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2004

In contrast to Satoh, the filter of claim 1 includes only one grounding point with respect to one acoustic resonator. In particular, the first terminal of claim 1 "is grounded via only a first grounding point" and the second terminal "is grounded via only a second grounding point." Therefore, the filter of claim 1 obtains fine band-pass characteristics, whereas the circuit of Satoh obtains low-pass characteristics.

Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Satoh at least because Satoh neither discloses nor suggests first and second terminals that are grounded via only first and second grounding points, respectively. In view of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) be withdrawn. Claims 2-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 26 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claims 2-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

#### Rejection in view of Beaudin

Claims 1, 2, 12, 17-20 and 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,710,677 to Beaudin et al. ("Beaudin"). Claim 1 includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by Satoh, namely, "one <u>capacitor</u> between a first terminal ... and a second terminal" wherein first and second resonators are connected respectively connected between the first and second terminals and grounding points. (emphasis added)

Beaudin describes a band reject filter with parallel resonators PR10, PR12 and series resonators SR2, SR4. The parallel resonators PR10, PR12 are connected between respective terminals of the series resonator SR4 and a ground terminal 14. (Beaudin at Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 51-55).

Appln. No.: 10/657,944

Amendment Dated: April 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2004

In contrast to Beaudin, Applicants' filter of claim 1 includes one capacitor between the terminals to which the first and second resonators are connected. Beaudin neither discloses nor suggests that the series resonator SR4 is a capacitor.

Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Beaudin at least because Beaudin neither discloses nor suggests one capacitor between first and second terminals that are grounded via resonators. In view of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) be withdrawn. Claims 2, 12, 17-20 and 23-26 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claims 2, 12, 17-20 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) be withdrawn.

#### Rejection in view of Yuda

Claims 1, 2, 12, 16, 17 and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 10-065490 to Yuda et al. ("Yuda"). Claim 1 is not anticipated by Yuda at least for the same reasons described above with regard to Satoh. In particular, Yuda neither discloses nor suggests first and second terminals that are grounded via only first and second grounding points, respectively.

With reference to Fig. 1, Yuda describes resonators 2, 4 between respective terminals and ground. However, Yuda further describes a second grounding point from such terminals via respective inductors 5, 6.

In contrast to Yuda, the filter of claim 1 includes only one grounding point with respect to one acoustic resonator. In particular, the first terminal of claim 1 "is grounded via only a first grounding point" and the second terminal "is grounded via only a second grounding point."

Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Yuda at least because Yuda neither discloses nor

Appln. No.: 10/657,944

Amendment Dated: April 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2004

suggests first and second terminals that are grounded via only first and second grounding points, respectively. In view of the amendments to claim 1 and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) be withdrawn. Claims 2, 12, 16, 17 and 21-26 depend from claim 1 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claims 2, 12, 16, 17 and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Satoh taken alone. Claims 11, 12 and 15 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1 and therefore include the features of claim 1. Therefore, claims 11, 12 and 15 are patentable over Satoh at least for the same reasons described above with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request therefore that the rejection of claims 11, 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

### Newly Added Claims

Claims 27-31 are newly added. Claim 28 includes the feature of a first terminal that "is grounded via only a first grounding point" and a second terminal that "is grounded via only a second grounding point." (emphasis added) Accordingly, claim 28 is patentable over the art of record at least for the same reasons described above with reference to claim 1. Claims 27 and 29-31 depend (directly or indirectly) from claim 1 or claim 28 and therefore include the features of claim 1 or 28, respectively, and are also patentable over the art of record.

Appln. No.: 10/657,944

Amendment Dated: April 5, 2005

Reply to Office Action of November 5, 2004

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Calder, Reg. 27,424

Christopher J. Dervishian, Reg. No. 42,480

IN. Crester

Attorneys for Applicants

CJD/cjd/fp

Attachment: Abstract

Dated: April 5, 2005

P.O. Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482 (610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

April 5, 2005